

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,053	03/24/2004	Stephen E. Bentschneider	LAB-106-B	4200
Todd L. Moore	7590 08/02/2007	,	EXAM	INER
YOUNG & BASILE, P.C. Suite 624 3001 West Big Beaver Road Troy, MI 48084-3107			CHEN, JOSE V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3637	
				•
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary						
		10/808,053	BENTSCHNEIDER, STEPHEN E.			
·	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		José V. Chen	3637			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES IN THE MAILING DATES OF THE MAILING DA	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin viil apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 M	a <u>y 2007</u> .				
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-5,8-11,13-18 and 21-26</u> is/are pend	ing in the application.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-5,8-11,13-18 and 21-26</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers		•			
9)	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(d) or (f).			
	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicati	on No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	· ·	ed in this National Stage			
	application from the International Bureau					
" 8	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ea.			
.;						
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/808,053

Art Unit: 3637

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1- 4, 8-11, 14-17, 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardinge in view of Good and Doyle. The patent to Hardinge teaches structure substantially as claimed including table, means for securing (at 6) including mounting plates, a plurality of legs, the only difference being that there is no means for adjusting position and the legs are not telescopingly adjustable. However, the patent to Good (26)) teaches the use of providing adjusting structure for a work surface to provide mobility and the patent to Doyle teaches the use of providing telescopingly adjustable legs with control means to be old. It would have been obvious at the time of the invention to modify the structure of Hardinge to include a means for adjusting position, as taught by Hughes and vertically adjustable legs and control means, as taught by Doyle since such structures are conventional alternative support structures used in the same intended purpose, thereby providing structure as claimed. The use of pneumatic adjusting structures and control means is conventional structure commercially available. To use such structures as an alternative structure used in the

Application/Control Number: 10/808,053

Art Unit: 3637

same intended purpose of providing an adjustment would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art, thereby providing structure as claimed.

Claim 5, 13, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hardinge in view of Good and Doyle as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Ostertag et al. The patent to Hardinge in view of Good and Doyle teaches structure substantially as claimed as discussed above including a table, the only difference being that there is no lighting fixture to provide light for the work area. However, the patent to Ostertag et al teaches the use of providing a lighting fixture for a work surface to be old. It would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the structure of Hardinge in view of Good to include a lighting fixture, as taught by Ostertag et al since such structure is used in the same intended prose of providing light for structures placed thereon, thereby providing structure as claimed.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05-24-07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The rejections still as stated above. Further, such modifications would have been predictable and within common sense with ordinary skill in the art.

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/808,053

Art Unit: 3637

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José V. Chen whose telephone number is (571)272-6865. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f,m-th 5:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (571)272-6867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3637

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) of 571-272/1000

José V. Chen Primary Examiner Art Unit 3637

Chen/jvc 07-27-07